arXiv:1206.3069v1 [math.AC] 14 Jun 2012

MONOMIAL LOCALIZATIONS AND POLYMATROIDAL IDEALS

SOMAYEH BANDARI AND JÜRGEN HERZOG

Abstract. In this paper we consider monomial localizations of monomial ideals and conjecture that a monomial ideal is polymatroidal if and only if all its monomial localizations have a linear resolution. The conjecture is proved for squarefree monomial ideals where it is equivalent to a well-known characterization of matroids. We prove our conjecture in many other special cases. We also introduce the concept of componentwise polymatroidal ideals and extend several of the results, known for polymatroidal ideals, to this new class of ideals.

Introduction

The class of polymatroidal ideals is one of the rare classes of monomial ideals with the property that all powers of an ideal in this class have a linear resolution. This is due to the fact that the powers of a polymatroidal ideal are again polymatroidal [1, Theorem 5.3] and that polymatroidal ideals have linear quotients [10, Lemma 1.3] which implies that they have linear resolutions. Recall that a monomial ideal is called polymatroidal, if its monomial generators correspond to the bases of a discrete polymatroid, see [5]. Since the set of bases of a discrete polymatroid is characterized by the so-called exchange property, it follows that a polymatroidal ideal may as well be characterized as follows: let $I \subset S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a monomial ideal generated in a single degree. We denote, as usual by $G(I)$ the unique minimal set of monomial generators of I. Then I is said to be polymatroidal, if for any two elements $u, v \in G(I)$ such that $\deg_{x_i}(u) > \deg_{x_i}(v)$ there exists an index j with $\deg_{x_j}(u) < \deg_{x_j}(v)$ such that $x_j(u/x_i) \in I$.

Recently it has been observed that a monomial localization of a polymatroidal is again polymatroidal [9, Corollary 3.2]. The monomial localization of a monomial ideal I with respect to a monomial prime ideal P is the monomial ideal $I(P)$ which is obtained from I by substituting the variables $x_i \notin P$ by 1. Observe that $I(P)$ is the unique monomial ideal with the property that $I(P)S_P = IS_P$. The monomial localization $I(P)$ can also be described as the saturation $I\colon (\prod_{x_i \notin P} x_i)^\infty$. Thus in the case that the polymatroidal ideal I is squarefree, in which case it is called matroidal, we see that $I(P) = I\colon u$ where $u = \prod_{x_i \notin P} x_i$.

By what we have explained so far it follows that all monomial localizations of polymatroidal ideals have a linear resolution. The natural question arises whether this property characterizes polymatroidal ideals. The main purpose of this paper is to discuss this question. In Theorem 1.1 we give an affirmative answer requiring

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13C13, 05E40.

Key words and phrases. Matroidal ideals, polymatroidal ideals, componentwise polymatroidal ideals, monomial localizations.

however more that just the condition that all monomial localizations have a linear resolution. To be precise we show, that a monomial ideal I is polymatroidal if and only $I\colon u$ has a linear resolution for all monomials u in S. In fact, among a few other equivalent conditions, we also show that I is polymatroidal if we only require that $I\colon u$ is generated in a single degree for all monomials $u \in S$. Since for a squarefree monomial ideal I, the colon ideal $I\colon u$ is a monomial localization for any monomial u, it follows (see Corollary 1.2) that a squarefree monomial ideal I is matroidal if and only if $I(P)$ is generated in a single degree for all monomial prime ideals P. It turns out that this characterization of matroidal ideals corresponds to a well-known characterization of matroids which says that a simplicial complex is a matroid if and only if all its induced subcomplexes are pure, see [11, Proposition 3.1].

Even though matroidal ideals are characterized by the property that all its monomial localizations have a linear resolution, we don't know whether the corresponding statement is true for polymatroidal ideals. There are simple examples of monomial ideals which show that all monomial localizations are generated in a single degree but the ideals themselves are not polymatroidal. However due to computational evidence we are lead to conjecture that the monomial ideals with the property that all monomial localizations have a linear resolution are precisely the polymatroidal ideals. In Section 2 we discuss several special cases which support this conjecture. In fact we give an affirmative answer to the conjecture in the following cases: 1. I is generated in degree 2 (Proposition 2.1), 2. I contains at least $n-1$ pure powers (Proposition 2.4), 3. I is monomial ideal in at most 3 variables (Corollary 2.5 and Proposition 2.7), 4. I has no embedded prime ideal and either $|\operatorname{Ass}(S/I)| \leq 3$ or $\operatorname{height}(I) = n-1$ (Proposition 2.8).

We would like to point out that in each of the special cases mentioned above we use completely different arguments for the proof of our conjecture. For the moment we do not have a general strategy to prove it.

In Section 3 we introduce componentwise polymatroidal ideals, namely those monomial ideals with the property that each of its components is generated by a polymatroidal ideal. In contrast to polymatroidal ideals, powers of componentwise polymatroidal ideals need not to be componentwise polymatroidal, unless the ideal is generated in at most two degrees, see Proposition 3.2. On the other, it might be that powers of componentwise linear ideals are componentwise linear. For this we could not find a counter example.

One would expect that an exchange property of its generators characterizes componentwise polymatroidal ideals. For that purpose we introduce the so-called non-pure exchange property and show in Proposition 3.5 that componentwise polymatroidal ideals enjoy the non-pure exchange property. On the other hand, we show by an example that an ideal with the non-pure exchange property need not to be componentwise polymatroidal.

It is natural to ask whether componentwise polymatroidal ideals have linear quotients. We expect that this is the case and prove it for ideals which are componentwise of Veronese type. It is also an open question whether ideals satisfying the non-pure exchange property have linear quotients, even they are not componentwise polymatroidal.

1. An algebraic characterization of polymatroidal ideals and monomial localizations of matroidal ideals

Let K be a field, $S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ the polynomial ring in the indeterminates $x_1, \dots, x_n$ and $I \subset S$ a monomial ideal. We first show

Theorem 1.1. *Let I be a monomial ideal. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) *I is polymatroidal.*
(b) *$I\colon u$ is polymatroidal for all monomials u.*
(c) *$I\colon u$ is generated in a single degree for all monomials u and has linear quotients with respect to the reverse lexicographic order of the generators.*
(d) *$I\colon u$ has a linear resolution for all monomials u.*
(e) *$I\colon u$ is generated in a single degree for all monomials u.*

Proof. (a) ⇒ (b): It is enough to show that for variable x_i, $I\colon x_i$ is polymatroidal. Let $I = \sum_{j=0}^{d} I_j x_i^j$, where for all $u \in G(I_j)$, $x_i \nmid u$. Then $I\colon x_i = I_0 + \sum_{j=1}^{d} I_j x_i^{j-1}$. Set $J = \sum_{j=1}^{d} I_j x_i^{j-1}$. Then $I = I_0 + x_i J$, and $I\colon x_i = I_0 + J$. If $J = 0$, then $I\colon x_i = I_0 = I$, and there is nothing to prove.

Now let $J \neq 0$. We want to show that $I_0 \subseteq J$. Let u be monomials with $u \in I_0$. Since $J \neq 0$ there exists a monomial $v \in I$ such that $v \in x_i J$. Since I is polymatroidal it satisfies the symmetric exchange property, see [5, Theorem 12.4.1]. Therefore, since x_i does not divide u but does divide v, it follows that there exists a variable x_t with $t \neq i$ such that $ux_i/x_t \in I$. Hence $ux_i/x_t \in x_i J$, so $u/x_t \in J$. This implies that $u \in J$. Thus we conclude that $I\colon x_i = J$.

Let $u, v \in G(J)$. So $x_i u, x_i v \in x_i J \subseteq I$. If $\deg_{x_i}(u) = \deg_{x_i}(v)$, since I is polymatroidal, it follows that $x_i u, x_i v$ satisfies exchange property. Hence exchange property is satisfied for u and v.

Let $\deg_{x_i}(u) > \deg_{x_i}(v)$, so $x_i | u$. Now for variable x_l with $\deg_{x_l}(u) > \deg_{x_l}(v)$, we want to show that there exists variable x_j such that $\deg_{x_j}(v) > \deg_{x_j}(u)$ and $(u/x_l)x_j \in G(J)$. Since $\deg_{x_l}(x_i u) > \deg_{x_l}(x_i v)$ and I is polymatroidal, it follows that there exists variable x_j such that $\deg_{x_j}(x_i v) > \deg_{x_j}(x_i u)$ and $(x_i u/x_l)x_j \in G(I)$. Since $x_i | u$, we have that $(x_i u/x_l)x_j \in I_t x_i^t$ for $t \geq 1$. Hence $(u/x_l)x_j \in I_t x_i^{t-1} \subseteq J$. Also we have that $\deg_{x_j}(v) > \deg_{x_j}(u)$.

(b) ⇒ (c): Any polymatroidal ideal is generated in a single degree and has linear quotients with respect to the reverse lexicographic order of the generators, as shown in [10, Lemma 1.3]. Therefore (b) implies (c) trivially.

(c) ⇒ (d) follows from the general fact that ideals generated in a single with linear quotients have a linear resolution (see [1, Lemma 4.1]), and (d) ⇒ (e) is trivial.

(e) ⇒ (a): Let $v, w \in G(I)$ with $\deg_{x_i}(v) > \deg_{x_i}(w)$. We want to show that there exists variable x_j such that $\deg_{x_j}(w) > \deg_{x_j}(v)$ and $(v/x_i)x_j \in G(I)$. By assumption $I\colon \frac{v}{x_i}$ is generated in a single degree. Hence, since $x_i \in G(I\colon v/x_i)$ it follows that $I\colon v/x_i$ is generated in degree 1. Hence, since $w/\gcd(w, v/x_i) \in I\colon v/x_i$, there exists $z \in G(I)$ such that $x_j = z/\gcd(z, v/x_i)$ for some j and such that x_j divides $w/\gcd(w, v/x_i)$. Then $\deg_{x_j}(w) > \deg_{x_j}(v/x_i)$. So since $\deg_{x_i}(v) > \deg_{x_i}(w)$ it follows that $x_j \neq x_i$. Hence $\deg_{x_j}(w) > \deg_{x_j}(v/x_i) = \deg_{x_j}(v)$. Our assumption (for $u = 1$) implies that I is generated in a single degree. Hence $\deg(z) = \deg(v)$. On the other hand, it follows from $x_j = z/\gcd(z, v/x_i)$ that $\deg_{x_l}(z) \leq \deg_{x_l}(v/x_i) = \deg_{x_l}(v)$ for all $l \neq i, j$ and $\deg_{x_j}(z) = \deg_{x_j}(v/x_i) + 1 = \deg_{x_j}(v) + 1$ and also $\deg_{x_i}(z) \leq \deg_{x_i}(v/x_i) = \deg_{x_i}(v) - 1$. Therefore, $z = (v/x_i)x_j$. $\square$

We denote the set of monomial prime ideals of $S = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ by $\mathcal{P}(S)$. Let $P \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ be a monomial prime ideal. Then $P = P_C$ for some subset $C \subset [n]$, where $P_C = (\{x_i \colon\ i \notin C\})$ and $IS_P = JS_P$ where J is the monomial ideal obtained from I by the substitution $x_i \mapsto 1$ for all $i \in C$. We call J the monomial localization of I with respect to P and denote it by $I(P)$.

For example, if $I = (x_1x_2x_3, x_2x_3x_4, x_3x_5x_6) \subset K[x_1, \ldots, x_6]$ and $C = \{4\}$, then $I(P_C) = (x_2x_3, x_3x_5x_6)$.

Let $C \subset [n]$ and set $x_C = \prod_{i \in C} x_i$. Then $I(P_C) = I \colon x_C^\infty = I \colon x_C^k$ for k large enough. In particular, if I is a squarefree monomial ideal we have that $I(P_C) = I \colon x_C$. Therefore we obtain

Corollary 1.2. *Let I be a squarefree monomial ideal. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) *The ideal I is a matroidal.*
(b) *For all $P \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ the ideal $I(P)$ is matroidal.*
(c) *For all $P \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ the ideal $I(P)$ is generated in a single degree and has linear quotients with respect to the reverse lexicographic order of the generators.*
(d) *For all $P \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ the ideal $I(P)$ has a linear resolution.*
(e) *For all $P \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ the ideal $I(P)$ is generated in a single degree.*

Corollary 1.3. *Let I be a squarefree monomial ideal. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) *The ideal I is a matroidal.*
(b) *For all $P \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ and all integers $k > 0$ the ideal $I^k(P)$ has a linear resolution.*
(c) *For all $P \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ there exists an integer $k > 0$ such that the ideal $I^k(P)$ has a linear resolution.*
(d) *For all $P \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ there exists an integer $k > 0$ such that the ideal $I^k(P)$ is generated in a single degree.*
(e) *For all $P \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ and all integers $k > 0$ the ideal $I^k(P)$ is generated in a single degree.*

Proof. (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b): Since I is a matroidal, I^k is polymatroidal for all k (see [1, Theorem 5.3]). Hence by [9, Corollary 3.2], $I^k(P)$ is polymatroidal for all $P \in \mathcal{P}(S)$. So $I^k(P)$ has a linear resolution for all $P \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ and all k.

The implications (b) $\Rightarrow$ (c) $\Rightarrow$ (d), and (b) $\Rightarrow$ (e) $\Rightarrow$ (d) are trivial.

(d) $\Rightarrow$ (a): By Corollary 1.2 it is enough to show that $I(P)$ is generated in a single degree for all P. By assumption we know that $(I(P))^k$ (which is equal to

$I^k(P)$) is generated in a single degree. Thus, since $I(P)$ is a squarefree, the desired conclusion follows once we have shown that if J is squarefree monomial ideal and J^k is generated in a single degree, then J is generated in a single degree as well. Let s be the smallest degree of a generator of J and assume that there exists $v \in G(J)$ with $\deg(v) = t$, $t > s$. Then our assumption implies that J^k is generated in degree sk. Since $v^k \in J^k$ and $\deg(v^k) = tk > sk$, there exist $u_1, \ldots, u_k \in G(J)$ such that $\prod_{i=1}^k u_i$ divides v^k and $\deg(u_i) = s$ for each $i = 1, \ldots, k$. Then u_1 divides v^k, so since u_1 and v are squarefree monomials, it follows that u_1 divides v, a contradiction. □

2. Monomial localizations of polymatroidal ideals

One would expect that Corollary 1.2 remains true if we replace in its statements "matroidal" by "polymatroidal". This is the case for the equivalence of (a) and (b). However the following example shows that (a) is not equivalent to (e) if we replace "matroidal" by "polymatroidal" in statement (a).

Indeed, let $I = (x_1^2, x_1x_2, x_3^2, x_2x_3)$. Then I is not polymatroidal, but all monomial localizations are generated in a single degree. On the other hand, the ideal I in this example does not have a linear resolution. So one may expect that polymatroidal ideals can be characterized by the properties (c) and (d) of Corollary 1.2.

In the following special cases we can prove this.

Proposition 2.1. *Let $I \subset K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ be a monomial ideal generated in degree 2. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) *The ideal I is a polymatroidal.*
(b) *For all $P \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ the ideal $I(P)$ is polymatroidal.*
(c) *For all $P \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ the ideal $I(P)$ is generated in a single degree and has linear quotients with respect to the reverse lexicographic order of the generators.*
(d) *For all $P \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ the ideal $I(P)$ has a linear resolution.*
(e) *After relabeling of the variables there exist integers $0 \leq k \leq m \leq n$ such that*

$$I = ((x_1, \ldots, x_k)(x_1, \ldots, x_m), J),$$

where J is a squarefree monomial ideal in the variables $x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_m$ satisfying the following property:

$(*)$ *If $x_ix_j \in J$ and $k+1 \leq l \leq m$ with $l \neq i, j$, then $x_ix_l \in J$ or $x_jx_l \in J$.*

Proof. The implication (a) ⇒ (b) is known ([9, Corollary 3.2]) and the implications (b) ⇒ (c) ⇒ (d) are known.

(d) ⇒ (e): After a relabeling of the variables we may assume the $x_i^2 \in I$ if and only if $i \in [k]$. Suppose that $k \geq 2$ and let $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ and $i \neq j$. Since I is generated in degree 2 and has a linear resolution it is known by [8, Theorem 3.2] that I has linear quotients with respect to a suitable order of the generators. We may assume that x_i^2 comes before x_j^2 in this order. Hence, since $(x_i^2)\colon x_j^2 = (x_i^2)$, there exists a monomial $u \in G(I)$ coming before x_j^2 such $(u)\colon x_j^2 = (x_i)$. It follows that $u = x_ix_j$. This shows that $(x_1, \ldots, x_k)^2 \subset I$.

Let $\mathcal{I}$ be the subset of elements $j \in [n]$ with the property that $j > k$ and $x_j | u$ for some $u \in G(I)$. After a relabeling of the variables $x_{k+1}, \dots, x_n$ we may assume that $\mathcal{I} = \{k+1, \dots, m\}$. Let $u = x_i x_j$ with $j \in \mathcal{I}$ and $i \in [k]$. Then $x_i \in I(P_{\{j\}})$, and since $I(P_{\{j\}})$ has a linear resolution, all generators of $I(P_{\{j\}})$ are of degree 1. In particular, for any $t \in [k]$ we must have that $x_t \in G(I(P_{\{j\}}))$. This implies that $x_t x_j \in G(I)$. Thus we have shown that $(x_1, \dots, x_k)(x_1, \dots, x_m) \subset I$.

Let J be the ideal generated by all $u \in G(I)$ which do not belong to the ideal $(x_1, \dots, x_k)(x_1, \dots, x_m)$. Then J is a squarefree monomial ideal in the variables $x_{k+1}, \dots, x_m$. Let $x_i x_j \in J$ and l an integer with $k+1 \leq l \leq m$ and $l \neq i, j$.

If $k = 0$, then $x_l x_h \in J$ for some h and J is matroidal by Corollary 1.2. Comparing $x_l x_h$ with $x_i x_j$ we see $x_i x_l \in J$ or $x_j x_l \in J$.

If $k > 0$, then $x_1 x_l \in I$. Therefore $x_1 \in I(P_{\{l\}})$, and hence $I(P_{\{l\}})$ is generated in degree 1, since it has a linear resolution. This implies that $x_i x_l \in J$ or $x_j x_l \in J$.

(e) $\Rightarrow$ (a): Let $u, v \in G(I)$. We have to show that this pair satisfies the polymatroidal exchange property. Since $(x_1, \dots, x_k)(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ is polymatroidal and J is matroidal because of $(*)$, we may assume that $u \in (x_1, \dots, x_k)(x_1, \dots, x_m)$ and $v \in J$.

Let $u = x_t x_l$ and $v = x_i x_j$, then the exchange property is satisfied because $x_s x_i \in G(I)$ or $x_s x_j \in G(I)$ for all $s \neq i, j$, due to $(*)$. $\square$

For the proof of the next result we recall the following well-known fact.

Lemma 2.2. *Let $J \subset S$ be a graded ideal with linear resolution and such that $\ell(S/J) < \infty$. Then $J = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^k$ for some k.*

Proof. Since $\ell(S/J) < \infty$ it follows that $\operatorname{reg}(S/J) = \max\{j\colon\ (S/J)_j \neq 0\}$, see [1, Lemma 1.1]. We may assume that J has a k-linear resolution. Therefore, $\operatorname{reg}(S/J) = k-1$, and hence $(S/J)_j = 0$ for $j \geq k$. It follows that $J = (x_1, \dots, x_n)^k$. $\square$

Definition 2.3. Given positive integers $d, a_1, \dots, a_n$. We let $I_{(d;a_1,\dots,a_n)} \subset S = K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be the monomial ideal generated by the monomials $u \in S$ of degree d satisfying $\deg_{x_i}(u) \leq a_i$ for all $i = 1, \dots, n$. Monomial ideals of this type are called ideals of *Veronese type*.

Obviously, monomial ideals of Veronese type are polymatroidal.

Proposition 2.4. *Let $I \subset K[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ be a monomial ideal generated in degree d and suppose that I contains at least $n-1$ pure powers of the variables, say $x_1^d, \dots, x_{n-1}^d$. Then the following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) *The ideal I is a polymatroidal.*
(b) *For all $P \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ the ideal $I(P)$ has a linear resolution.*
(c) *The ideals I and $I(P_{\{n\}})$ have a linear resolution.*
(d) *$I = I_{(d;d,\dots,d,k)}$ for some k.*

Proof. The implication (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) is known and the implications (b) $\Rightarrow$ (c) and (d) $\Rightarrow$ (a) are trivial. Thus it remains to show that (c) implies (d).

To this end we write
$$I = I_0 + I_1 x_n + \cdots + I_k x_n^k,$$

where I_j is a monomial ideal in $S' = K[x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1}]$ for all j.

Several times in our proof we will apply the following fact, which is an immediate consequence of [4, Theorem 2.1]: let $J \subset S$ be a monomial ideal with linear resolution, and let $a_1, \ldots, a_n$ be positive integers. Then the monomial ideal J' generated by the monomials $u \in G(J)$ with $\deg_{x_i} u \leq a_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$ has linear resolution as well. We refer to this result as to the 'restriction lemma'.

Applying the restriction lemma to I it follows that I_0 has a d-linear resolution. Our assumption implies that $x_1^d, \ldots x_{n-1}^d \in I_0$. In particular, it follows that $\ell(S'/I_0) < \infty$. Thus Lemma 2.2 implies that $I_0 = \mathfrak{n}^d$ where $\mathfrak{n} = (x_1, \ldots, x_{n-1})$.

Next we show by induction on j that $I_{k-j} = \mathfrak{n}^{d-k+j}$. For $j = 0$, we have to show that $I_k = \mathfrak{n}^{d-k}$. Indeed, by assumption the ideal $I(P_{\{n\}}) = I_0 + I_1 + \cdots + I_k$ has a linear resolution. Since I_j is generated in degree $d - j$, it follows that $I(P_{\{n\}}) = I_k$ and moreover, that $\mathfrak{n}^d = I_0 \subset I_k$. Hence I_k has a $(d - k)$-linear resolution and contains x_i^{d-k} for $i = 1, \ldots, n - 1$. Again applying Lemma 2.2, it follows that $I_k = \mathfrak{n}^{d-k}$. This completes the proof of the induction begin.

Now assume that $j > 0$ (and $\leq k - 1$), and assume that $I_{k-l} = \mathfrak{n}^{d-k+l}$ for $l = 0, \ldots, j - 1$. We set

$$J = I_0 + I_1 x_n + \cdots + I_{k-j} x_n^{k-j} \quad \text{and} \quad L = \mathfrak{n}^{d-k+j-1} x_n^{k-j+1} + \cdots + \mathfrak{n}^{d-k} x_n^k.$$

The ideal L is polymatroidal, and hence has a d-linear resolution. Applying the restriction lemma to I we see that J has a d-linear resolution. We have

$$J \cap L = (I_0 \cap L) + (I_1 x_n \cap L) + \cdots + (I_{k-j} x_n^{k-j} \cap L) =$$

$$I_0 x_n^{k-j+1} + I_1 x_n^{k-j+1} + \cdots + I_{k-j} x_n^{k-j+1} = (I_0 + I_1 + \cdots + I_{k-j}) x_n^{k-j+1}.$$

So $\operatorname{reg}(J \cap L) \geq d + 1$. On the other hand by the exact sequence

$$0 \to J \cap L \to J \oplus L \to I \to 0$$

we have that $\operatorname{reg}(J \cap L) \leq \max\{\operatorname{reg}(J \oplus L), \operatorname{reg}(I) + 1\} = d + 1$. Then $\operatorname{reg}(J \cap L) = d + 1$. Hence $J \cap L = (I_0 + I_1 + \cdots + I_{k-j}) x_n^{k-j+1} = I_{k-j} x_n^{k-j+1}$. So I_{k-j} has a $(d - k + j)$-linear resolution and contains x_i^{d-k+j} for $i = 1, \ldots, n - 1$, because $\mathfrak{n}^d = I_0 \subset I_{k-j}$. By Lemma 2.2, $I_{k-j} = \mathfrak{n}^{d-k+j}$. Altogether we have shown that $I = \mathfrak{n}^d + \mathfrak{n}^{d-1} x_n + \cdots + \mathfrak{n}^{d-k} x_n^k = I_{(d;d,\ldots,d,k)}$, as desired. $\square$

Corollary 2.5. *Let $I \subset K[x_1, x_2]$ be a monomial ideal. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) *I is polymatroidal.*
(b) *For all $P \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ the ideal $I(P)$ has a linear resolution.*
(c) *I has a linear resolution.*

Proof. The conditions (b) and (c) are equivalent, because $I(P)$ is a principal ideal for $P \neq (x_1, x_2)$, and the implication (a) $\Rightarrow$ (b) is known. For the proof of the implication (b) $\Rightarrow$ (a) we write $I = uJ$, where u is the greatest common divisor of the generators of I. I is polymatroidal if and only if J is polymatroidal, and I satisfies (b) if and only if J does. So we assume from the very beginning that greatest common divisor of the generators I is 1. This implies that I contains a pure power of x_1 or a pure power of x_2. Thus the desired conclusion follows from Proposition 2.4. $\square$

Definition 2.6. Let I be a monomial ideal. We say that I satisfies the *strong exchange property* if I is generated in a single degree and for all $u, v \in G(I)$ and for all i, j with $\deg_{x_i}(u) > \deg_{x_i}(v)$ and $\deg_{x_j}(u) < \deg_{x_j}(v)$, one has $x_j(u/x_i) \in I$.

Proposition 2.7. *Let $I \subset S = K[x_1, x_2, x_3]$ be a monomial ideal. The following conditions are equivalent:*

(a) *I is polymatroidal.*
(b) *I is polymatroidal satisfying the strong exchange property.*
(c) *For all $P \in \mathcal{P}(S)$ the ideal $I(P)$ has a linear resolution.*

Proof. The implications (b) $\Rightarrow$ (a) and (a) $\Rightarrow$ (c) are known. This it remains to be shown that (c) implies (b). Let $I = uJ$ where u is the greatest common divisor of the generators of I. It is known [7, Theorem 1.1] that I is polymatroidal satisfying the strong exchange property, if and only if J is of Veronese type. Since $I(P)$ has a linear resolution for all $P \in P(S)$ if and only if the same holds true for all $J(P)$, we may assume from the very beginning that $u = 1$, and then have to show that I is of Veronese type. Let $a_i = \max\{\deg_{x_i}(u)\colon\ u \in G(I)\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, 3$. We claim that $I = I_{(d;a_1,a_2,a_3)}$ where d is the common degree of the generators of I. We first show that for each i the set of monomials

$$\mathcal{A} = \{u \in K[x_1, x_2, x_3]\colon\ \deg(u) = d, \deg_{x_i}(u) = a_i \text{ and } \deg_{x_j}(u) \leq a_j \text{ for } j \neq i\}$$

belongs to I.

Indeed, (c) implies that $I(P_{\{i\}})$ is generated by the monomials $v \in K[x_j, x_k]$ such that $vx_i^{a_i} \in I$ and has a linear resolution. Therefore, by Corollary 2.5, $I(P_{\{i\}})$ is polymatroidal. Hence there exist numbers $0 \leq e \leq f \leq d - a_i$ such that

$$I(P_{\{i\}}) = (x_j^r x_k^s\colon\ r + s = d - a_i, r \leq a_j, s \leq a_k \text{ and } e \leq r \leq f).$$

Assume now that $\mathcal{A} \not\subset I$. Then it follows $e > 0$ or $f < d - a_i$. We may assume that $e > 0$. Therefore, $x_k^{d-a_i} x_i^{a_i} \notin I$. On the other hand, since the greatest common divisor of the elements of $G(I)$ is equal to 1, it follows that there exists monomial $x_k^{d-b} x_i^b \in I$ with $b < a_i$. Hence $x_k^{d-b} \in I(P_{\{i\}})$, a contradiction because $I(P_{\{i\}})$ does not contain a pure power of x_k.

In order to complete the proof of the claim, we introduce the following ideals J_{b_1,b_2,b_3} with $a_i \leq b_i \leq d$ for $i = 1, 2, 3$. The ideal J_{b_1,b_2,b_3} is generated by all generators of I and all monomials $x_1^{r_1} x_2^{r_2} x_3^{r_3}$ of degree d such that $r_j \leq b_j$ for all j and there exists $i \in [3]$ with $a_i \leq r_i \leq b_i$. We will show by induction on $b_1 + b_2 + b_3$ that J_{b_1,b_2,b_3} has a linear resolution for all b_i. In particular, $J_{d,d,d}$ has a linear resolution. Hence by Lemma 2.2, $J_{d,d,d} = (x_1, x_2, x_3)^d$ since $J_{d,d,d}$ contains the pure powers x_i^d. This then implies that $I = I_{(d;a_1,a_2,a_3)}$.

The induction begin with $b_1 + b_2 + b_3 = a_1 + a_2 + a_3$ is trivial because in that case $a_i = b_i$ and $J_{a_1,a_2,a_3} = I$, which by assumption has a linear resolution. Now assume that $b_1 + b_2 + b_3 > a_1 + a_2 + a_3$. Then $b_i > a_i$ for some i, say for $i = 1$. By induction hypothesis the ideal $H = J_{b_1-1,b_2,b_3}$ has a d-linear resolution. Let $J = J_{b_1,b_2,b_3}$, and consider the exact sequence

$$0 \longrightarrow H \longrightarrow J \longrightarrow J/H \longrightarrow 0.$$

The module J/H is annihilated by x_2 and x_3. Therefore, J/H is an $S/(x_2, x_3)$-module generated by the residue classes of the elements $vx_1^{b_1}$ with $v \in K[x_2, x_3]$ of degree $d - b_1$. Since no power of x_1 annihilates the generators of J/H it follows that J/H is a free $S/(x_2, x_3)$. It follows that J/H has a d-linear resolution. Therefore we conclude from the above exact sequence that J has a d-linear resolution. □

Proposition 2.8. *Let $I \subset S = K[x_1, \ldots, x_n]$ be a monomial ideal with no embedded prime ideals such that $I(P)$ has a linear resolution for all $P \in V^*(I)$, and let* $\mathrm{Ass}(S/I) = \{P_1, \ldots, P_r\}$. *Let $\mathfrak{m} = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$ be the graded maximal ideal of S. Then the following holds:*

(a) *If $P_i + P_j = \mathfrak{m}$ for all $i \neq j$, then I is polymatroidal.*

(b) *If $r \leq 2$, then I is a transversal polymatroidal ideal. If $r = 3$, then either I is again a transversal polymatroidal ideal or I is a matroidal ideal generated in degree 2 of the form $I = P_1 \cap P_2 \cap P_3$ such that $\bigcap_{i=1}^3 G(P_i) = \emptyset$ and $G(P_i) \cup G(P_j) = \{x_1, \ldots, x_n\}$ for all $i \neq j$.*

(c) *If* $\mathrm{height}(I) = n - 1$, *then I is polymatroidal.*

Proof. Let $P \in \mathrm{Ass}(S/I)$. Since I is a monomial ideal with no embedded prime ideals, it follows that P is a minimal prime ideal of I. Therefore, $\ell(S(P)/I(P)) < \infty$. Since $I(P)$ has a linear resolution, it follows from Lemma 2.2, that $I(P) = P^k$ for some k. Therefore $I = P_1^{a_1} \cap \cdots \cap P_r^{a_r}$.

(a) Since I is generated in a single degree and $P_i + P_j = \mathfrak{m}$ for all $i \neq j$, it follows from a result of Francisco and Van Tuyl [3, Theorem 3.1] that I is polymatroidal.

(b) If $r = 1$, then $I = P_1^{a_1}$ is a transversal polymatroidal.

If $r = 2$, then $I = P_1^{a_1} \cap P_2^{a_2}$. Since I is generated in a single degree we conclude that $G(P_1) \cap G(P_2) = \emptyset$. Therefore, $I = P_1^{a_1} P_2^{a_2}$, and the assertion follows.

Now let $r = 3$, then $I = P_1^{a_1} \cap P_2^{a_2} \cap P_3^{a_3}$. We may assume that I is full supported, i.e., $\{x_1, \ldots, x_n\} = \bigcup_{u \in G(I)} \mathrm{supp}(u)$.

First assume that $P_i \nsubseteq P_j + P_k$ for all i, j, k. Then, since $I(P_j + P_k) = P_j^{a_j} \cap P_k^{a_k}$ is generated in a single degree, it follows that $G(P_j) \cap G(P_k) = \emptyset$ for $j \neq k$. Hence $I = P_1^{a_1} P_2^{a_2} P_3^{a_3}$ is a transversal polymatroidal ideal.

Next we may assume that $P_1 \subseteq P_2 + P_3$. In particular, $P_2 + P_3 = \mathfrak{m}$, since I is full supported. We claim that $P_i + P_j = \mathfrak{m}$ for all $i \neq j$ and hence by part (a), I is polymatroidal. It remains to be shown that $P_1 + P_2 = \mathfrak{m}$ and $P_1 + P_3 = \mathfrak{m}$. Assume that $P_1 + P_2 \neq \mathfrak{m}$ and set $P = P_1 + P_2$. Then $I(P) = P_1^{a_1} \cap P_2^{a_2}$. Since $I(P)$ is generated in a single degree, we have that $G(P_1) \cap G(P_2) = \emptyset$. So since $P_1 \subseteq P_2 + P_3$, it follows that $P_1 \subseteq P_3$, a contradiction. Therefore $P_1 + P_2 = \mathfrak{m}$. Similarly we can see that $P_1 + P_3 = \mathfrak{m}$.

Now we want to show that $G(P_i) \cap G(P_j) \nsubseteq G(P_k)$ for distinct i, j and k. Assume $G(P_i) \cap G(P_j) \subseteq G(P_k)$ for some i, j and k. Let x_ℓ be a variable. If $x_\ell \in G(P_i) \cap G(P_j)$, then $x_\ell \in G(P_k)$, and if $x_\ell \notin G(P_i) \cap G(P_j)$, then we may assume that

$x_\ell \notin G(P_i)$. In that case it follows that $x_\ell \in G(P_k)$, since $P_i + P_k = \mathfrak{m}$. Therefore $P_k = \mathfrak{m}$, a contradiction.

Now we claim that $a_1 = a_2 = a_3$. We may assume that $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq a_3$ and that I is generated in degree d. Let $x_i \in G(P_1) \cap G(P_2) \setminus G(P_3)$ and $x_j \in G(P_3) \setminus G(P_1)$. Then since $a_1 \geq a_2$, it follows that $x_i^{a_1} x_j^{a_3} \in I$. So there exist integers $s \leq a_1$ and $t \leq a_3$ such that $x_i^s x_j^t \in G(I)$. Since $x_i^s x_j^t \in P_3^{a_3}$ and $x_i \notin P_3$, we have $x_j^t \in P_3^{a_3}$, and so $t = a_3$. On the other hand, since $x_i^s x_j^t \in P_1^{a_1}$ and $x_j \notin P_1$, it follows that $x_i^s \in P_1^{a_1}$, and so $s = a_1$. Hence $x_i^{a_1} x_j^{a_3} \in G(I)$. Therefore $d = a_1 + a_3$. Now let $x_i \in G(P_1) \cap G(P_3) \setminus G(P_2)$ and $x_j \in G(P_2) \setminus G(P_1)$. Then similarly $x_i^{a_1} x_j^{a_2} \in G(I)$, so $d = a_1 + a_2$. Therefore $a_2 = a_3$. Set $a = a_2 = a_3$. Next we show that $a_1 < 2a$. Assume $a_1 \geq 2a$. Let $x_i \in G(P_1) \cap G(P_2)$ and $x_j \in G(P_1) \cap G(P_3)$, then $x_i^{a_1 - a} x_j^a \in I$. Hence $a_1 = \deg(x_i^{a_1-a} x_j^a) \geq d = a_1 + a$, so $a \leq 0$, a contradiction. Now let $x_i \in G(P_1) \cap G(P_2)$, $x_j \in G(P_1) \cap G(P_3)$ and $x_k \in G(P_3)$. Then $x_i^a x_j^{a_1-a} x_k^{2a-a_1} \in I$. Therefore, $2a = \deg(x_i^a x_j^{a_1-a} x_k^{2a-a_1}) \geq d = a_1 + a$, hence $a \geq a_1$, and so $a_1 = a$.

Now we have $I = P_1^a \cap P_2^a \cap P_3^a$. We claim that $a = 1$. The claim implies that $I = P_1 \cap P_2 \cap P_3$. Hence, since I is generated in a single degree we conclude that $G(P_1) \cap G(P_2) \cap G(P_3) = \emptyset$.

In order to prove the claim, assume to contrary that $a > 1$. Let $x_i \in G(P_1) \cap G(P_2)$, $x_j \in G(P_1) \cap G(P_3)$ and $x_k \in G(P_2) \cap G(P_3)$. Then $x_i^{a-1} x_j^{a-1} x_k \in I$, because $x_i^{a-1} x_j^{a-1} \in P_1^a$, $x_i^{a-1} x_k \in P_2^a$ and $x_j^{a-1} x_k \in P_3^a$. So $2a - 1 = \deg(x_i^{a-1} x_j^{a-1} x_k) \geq d = 2a$, a contradiction.

(c) If $r = 1$, then $I = P_1^{a_1}$ is polymatroidal, and if $r > 1$, the assertion follows from (a). $\square$

Based on Proposition 2.1, Proposition 2.4, Corollary 2.5, Proposition 2.7 and Proposition 2.8 and based on experimental evidence we are inclined to make the following

Conjecture 2.9. A monomial ideal I is polymatroidal if and only if $I(P)$ has a linear resolution for all monomial prime ideals P.

The following examples show that the localization condition of Conjecture 2.9 can not be weakened.

Example 2.10. (a) The ideal $I = (x_1 x_3^2, x_1^2 x_3, x_1 x_2 x_3, x_2^2 x_3)$ and all $I \colon x_i$ have a linear resolution, but I is not polymatroidal.

(b) The ideal $I = (x_1^3, x_1^2 x_2, x_1^2 x_3, x_2 x_3 x_4, x_1 x_2 x_3, x_1 x_3 x_4, x_1^2 x_4)$ and all $I(P_{\{i\}})$ have a linear resolution, but I is not polymatroidal.

(c) The ideal $I = (x_1^3, x_1^2 x_2, x_1^2 x_3, x_2^3, x_1 x_2^2, x_2^2 x_3, x_3^3, x_1 x_3^2, x_2 x_3^2)$ has linear relations, and all $I(P_{\{i\}})$ are polymatroidal, but I is not polymatroidal.

For the proof of Proposition 2.8(c) one could skip the assumption that I has no embedded components, if one could prove the following statement: $(*)$ Let $I \subset S$ be a monomial ideal with linear resolution and such that $I\mathfrak{m}$ is polymatroidal. Then I is polymatroidal.

Indeed, assuming $(*)$ the following can be shown: Let $I = J \cap Q$ and assume that I has a linear resolution, J is componentwise polymatroidal and Q is $\mathfrak{m}$-primary, then I is polymatroidal. To see this, observe that $I\mathfrak{m}^{j-d} = I_{\langle j\rangle} = J_{\langle j\rangle}$ for $j \gg 0$, where d is the degree of the generators of I. Here, for any graded ideal L, we denote by $L_{\langle j\rangle}$ the ideal generated by the jth graded component of L. Since J is componentwise polymatroidal it follows that $I\mathfrak{m}^{j-d}$ is polymatroidal. The assertion now follows by induction on $j-d$ and by using $(*)$.

Observe that $(*)$ holds if our Conjecture 2.9 is satisfied, because $I(P) = (I\mathfrak{m})(P)$ for all $P \neq \mathfrak{m}$.

We believe that if I is a polymatroidal ideal generated in degree d, then $(I : \mathfrak{m})_{\langle d-1\rangle}$ is polymatroidal. It can be shown that this is the case at least when I is a polymatroidal ideal satisfying the strong exchange property. Assuming this is true in general, the above condition $(*)$ follows, because $I = I\mathfrak{m} : \mathfrak{m}$, if I has a linear resolution. Obviously we have $I \subseteq I\mathfrak{m} : \mathfrak{m}$. Assume the inclusion is strict. Then there exists a homogeneous element $f \in I\mathfrak{m} : \mathfrak{m} \setminus I$. Thus the residue class of f in S/I is a non-zero socle element of S/I. Say, I has a d-linear resolution. Then it follows that $\deg(f) = d-1$. On the other hand, $I\mathfrak{m}$ has $(d+1)$-linear resolution. Therefore $I\mathfrak{m} : \mathfrak{m}$ is generated in degree $\geq d$, a contradiction since $f \in I\mathfrak{m} : \mathfrak{m}$.

Note that our conjecture is equivalent to the following statement: let I be monomial ideal with linear resolution. Then I is polymatroidal if and only if $I(P_{\{i\}})$ is polymatroidal for all i. We prove this version of Conjecture 2.9 under additional assumptions.

Proposition 2.11. *Let I be a monomial ideal with d-linear resolution, and assume that $I(P_{\{i\}}) = I_{(d-a_i;a_1,\dots,a_{i-1},a_{i+1},\dots,a_n)}$ for $i = 1,\dots,n$. Then $I = I_{(d;a_1,\dots,a_n)}$.*

Proof. For $k = 1,\dots,n$, let $I_k = x_k^{a_k} I(P_{\{k\}})$ and set $J = \sum_{k=1}^n I_k$. Then $J \subseteq I$. We first show that $(J : \mathfrak{m}^\infty)_{\langle d\rangle} = I$. In fact, by the definition of J it follows that $(I/J)_{x_k} = 0$ for $k = 1,\dots,n$. Therefore, I/J is a module of finite length, and hence we get

$$I \subseteq (J : \mathfrak{m}^\infty)_{\geq d} \subseteq (I : \mathfrak{m}^\infty)_{\geq d}. \tag{1}$$

Here for any graded ideal L we set $L_{\geq d} = \bigoplus_{i\geq d} L_i$.

Since I has d-linear resolution, it follows that $(I : \mathfrak{m}^\infty)_{\geq d} = I$. Indeed, our assumption on I implies that $I : \mathfrak{m}^\infty = I + H$ where H is generated in degree $\leq d-1$. This follows from [2, Corollary 20.19]. Thus $(I : \mathfrak{m}^\infty)_{\geq d} = I + \mathfrak{m}H_{\langle d-1\rangle}$. Since $\mathfrak{m}H_{\langle d-1\rangle} \subset I$, the desired conclusion follows. Thus in combination with (1) we see that $(J : \mathfrak{m}^\infty)_{\geq d} = I$. Since I is generated in degree d, we even get $(J : \mathfrak{m}^\infty)_{\langle d\rangle} = I$.

Now we want to show that $(J : \mathfrak{m}^\infty)_{\langle d\rangle} = I_{(d;a_1,\dots,a_n)}$. Let $u \in (J : \mathfrak{m}^\infty)_{\langle d\rangle}$ such that $\deg(u) = d$ and $u\mathfrak{m}^r \subseteq J \subseteq I_{(d;a_1,\dots,a_n)}$ for some integer $r \geq 0$. Then $ux_i^r \in I_{(d;a_1,\dots,a_n)}$ for all $i \in [n]$. Hence for all $i \in [n]$ there exists $v_i \in G(I_{(d;a_1,\dots,a_n)})$ such that $v_i | ux_i^r$. Therefore, $\deg_{x_j}(v_i) \leq \deg_{x_j}(u)$ for all $j \neq i$. Since $\deg(u) = \deg(v_i) = d$, it follows that $\deg_{x_i}(u) \leq \deg_{x_i}(v_i) \leq a_i$. This shows that $u \in I_{(d;a_1,\dots,a_n)}$. Hence we proved that $(J : \mathfrak{m}^\infty)_{\langle d\rangle} \subseteq I_{(d;a_1,\dots,a_n)}$.

Now let $x_1^{b_1}\cdots x_n^{b_n}\in G(I_{(d;a_1,\ldots,a_n)})$, then $\sum_{i=1}^n b_i=d$ and $b_i\leq a_i$ for all $i\in[n]$. We claim that $x_1^{b_1}\cdots x_n^{b_n}\mathfrak{m}^s\subseteq J$ with $s=\sum_{i=1}^n a_i-d$. Let $x_1^{c_1}\cdots x_n^{c_n}\in G(\mathfrak{m}^s)$. Then $x_1^{b_1+c_1}\cdots x_n^{b_n+c_n}\in x_1^{b_1}\cdots x_n^{b_n}\mathfrak{m}^s$. If $b_i+c_i<a_i$ for all i, then $\sum_{i=1}^n a_i=d+s=\sum_{i=1}^n b_i+\sum_{i=1}^n c_i<\sum_{i=1}^n a_i$, a contradiction. Hence for convenience we may assume that $b_1+c_1\geq a_1$, and show that $x_1^{b_1+c_1}\cdots x_n^{b_n+c_n}\in I_1=x_1^{a_1}I_{(d-a_1;a_2,\ldots,a_n)}$. Since $b_1+c_1\geq a_1$, it is enough to show that $x_2^{b_2+c_2}\cdots x_n^{b_n+c_n}\in I_{(d-a_1;a_2,\ldots,a_n)}$.

We may assume that $b_i+c_i>a_i$ for $i=2,\ldots,t$ and $b_i+c_i\leq a_i$ for $i=t+1,\ldots,n$ with $1\leq t\leq n$. Since $b_i\leq a_i$ for all i, it follows that

$$\sum_{i=1}^t a_i+\sum_{i=t+1}^n(b_i+c_i)=\sum_{i=1}^t a_i+d-\sum_{i=1}^t b_i+\sum_{i=t+1}^n c_i=\sum_{i=1}^t(a_i-b_i)+\sum_{i=t+1}^n c_i+d\geq d.$$

Hence $\sum_{i=2}^t a_i+\sum_{i=t+1}^n(b_i+c_i)\geq d-a_1$. This implies that

$$x_2^{a_2}\cdots x_t^{a_t}x_{t+1}^{b_{t+1}+c_{t+1}}\cdots x_n^{b_n+c_n}\in I_{(d-a_1;a_2,\ldots,a_n)}.$$

Therefore $x_2^{b_2+c_2}\cdots x_n^{b_n+c_n}=w(x_2^{a_2}\cdots x_t^{a_t}x_{t+1}^{b_{t+1}+c_{t+1}}\cdots x_n^{b_n+c_n})\in I_{(d-a_1;a_2,\ldots,a_n)}$, as desired. □

3. COMPONENTWISE POLYMATROIDAL IDEALS

In this section we extend the notion of polymatroidal ideals to monomial ideals which are not necessarily generated in a single degree.

Let I be a monomial ideal. We denote by $I_{\langle j\rangle}$ the monomial ideal generated by all monomial of degree j in I. The ideal I is called *componentwise linear*, if $I_{\langle j\rangle}$ has a linear resolution for all j. Basic properties about componentwise linear ideals can be found in [5].

Definition 3.1. Let I be a monomial ideal. We say that I is *componentwise polymatroidal*, if $I_{\langle j\rangle}$ is polymatroidal for all j.

Observe that if d is the highest degree of a generator of I, then I is componentwise polymatroidal if and only if $I_{\langle j\rangle}$ is polymatroidal for all $j\leq d$. Indeed, $I_{\langle j\rangle}=I_{\langle d\rangle}\mathfrak{m}^{j-d}$ for $j\geq d$. Moreover, all powers of $\mathfrak{m}$ are polymatroidal and products of polymatroidal ideals are again polymatroidal, see [1, Theorem 5.3]

It is easy to see that I is componentwise polymatroidal if and only if $I\colon u$ is componentwise polymatroidal for all monomials u. However if we only assume that $I\colon u$ is componentwise linear for all monomials u, it does not necessarily follow that I is componentwise polymatroidal. Indeed, let $I=(x_1x_2,x_1x_3^2,x_2x_3^2)$. Then $I\colon u$ is componentwise linear for all monomials u, but I is not componentwise polymatroidal.

It is natural to ask whether powers of componentwise polymatroidal ideals are again componentwise polymatroidal. There is a positive answer to this question in the following case.

Proposition 3.2. *Let I be a componentwise polymatroidal ideal generated in at most 2 degrees. Then I^k is componentwise polymatroidal for all k.*

Proof. The statement is trivial if I is generated in a single degree. So now assume that I is generated in 2 degrees, say, in degree d and $d+t$ with $t>0$. Then $I = I_{\langle d\rangle} + I_{\langle d+t\rangle}$. Hence

$$I^k = \sum_{j=0}^{k} (I_{\langle d\rangle})^{k-j}(I_{\langle d+t\rangle})^j. \tag{2}$$

Since I^k is generated in degree $\geq dk$ it remains to be shown that $(I^k)_{\langle kd+r\rangle}$ is polymatroidal for all $r \geq 0$. It follows from (2) that

$$(I^k)_{\langle kd+r\rangle} = \sum_{j=0}^{\ell} (I_{\langle d\rangle})^{k-j}(I_{\langle d+t\rangle})^j \mathfrak{m}^{r-tj},$$

where $\ell = \min\{k, \lfloor r/t \rfloor\}$.

Observe that for $j < \ell$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} (I_{\langle d\rangle})^{k-j}(I_{\langle d+t\rangle})^j \mathfrak{m}^{r-tj} &= (I_{\langle d\rangle})^{k-j-1}(I_{\langle d+t\rangle})^j I_{\langle d\rangle}\mathfrak{m}^t \mathfrak{m}^{r-t(j+1)} \\ &\subseteq (I_{\langle d\rangle})^{k-(j+1)}(I_{\langle d+t\rangle})^{j+1}\mathfrak{m}^{r-t(j+1)}. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $(I^k)_{\langle kd+r\rangle} = (I_{\langle d\rangle})^{k-\ell}(I_{\langle d+t\rangle})^{\ell}\mathfrak{m}^{r-t\ell}$. Since products of polymatroidal ideals are polymatroidal the desired conclusion follows. $\square$

In general powers of componentwise polymatroidal ideals are not componentwise polymatroidal.

Example 3.3. Let $I = (x_1^2, x_2^2x_3, x_1x_2x_3, x_1x_2^2, x_1x_3^3, x_2x_3^3)$. By using Proposition 2.7 it is easy to see that I is componentwise polymatroidal. However $(I^2)_{\langle 6\rangle}$ is not polymatroidal, because $(I^2)_{\langle 6\rangle}(P_{\{3\}}) = (x_1x_2^3, x_2^4, x_1^2x_2, x_1^3)$ is not generated in a single degree.

One would expect that componentwise polymatroidal ideals can also be characterized by an exchange property of its minimal set of monomial generators. Suppose for a monomial ideal I we require that for all monomials $u, v \in G(I)$ the following condition holds: $(*)$ if $\deg_{x_i}(u) > \deg_{x_i}(v)$ for some i, then there exists an integer j such that $\deg_{x_j}(v) > \deg_{x_j}(u)$ and $x_j(u/x_i) \in I$. Then it is easily checked that I is necessarily generated in a single degree and hence polymatroidal.

Therefore we give the following

Definition 3.4. Let I be a monomial ideal. We say that I satisfies the *non-pure exchange property*, if for all $u, v \in G(I)$ with $\deg(u) \leq \deg(v)$ and for all i such that $\deg_{x_i}(v) > \deg_{x_i}(u)$, there exists j such that $\deg_{x_j}(v) < \deg_{x_j}(u)$ and $x_j(v/x_i) \in I$.

Proposition 3.5. *If I is componentwise polymatroidal, then I has the non-pure exchange property.*

Proof. Let $u, v \in G(I)$ with $\deg(u) \leq \deg(v) = t$ and $\deg_{x_i}(v) > \deg_{x_i}(u)$ for some i. We may assume that $\deg(u) < \deg(v)$, since $I_{\langle t\rangle}$ is polymatroidal. By using the fact that u does not divide v, it follows that there exists $l \neq i$ such that

$$\deg_{x_l}(v) < \deg_{x_l}(u). \tag{3}$$

Since $\deg(u) < \deg(v)$, there exists integer a such that $\deg(ux_l^a) = \deg(v)$. Then there exists j such that

$$\deg_{x_j}(v) < \deg_{x_j}(ux_l^a), \tag{4}$$

since $I_{\langle t\rangle}$ is polymatroidal and since $\deg_{x_i}(v) > \deg_{x_i}(u) = \deg_{x_i}(ux_l^a)$. Moreover, $x_j(v/x_i) \in I$. If $j = l$, then by (3), $\deg_{x_j}(v) < \deg_{x_j}(u)$ and $x_j(v/x_i) \in I$. If $j \neq l$, then (4) implies that $\deg_{x_j}(v) < \deg_{x_j}(ux_l^a) = \deg_{x_j}(u)$ and $x_j(v/x_i) \in I$. $\square$

Unfortunately, the converse of Proposition 3.5 is not true. Indeed, let $I = (x_1x_2, x_1x_3^2, x_2x_3^2)$. Then I has the non-pure exchange property but $I_{\langle 3\rangle}$ is not polymatroidal. On the other hand, I has linear quotients. Thus the question arises whether any monomial ideal satisfying the non-pure exchange property has linear quotients. In view of Proposition 3.5 a positive answer to this question would imply that any componentwise polymatroidal ideal has linear quotients. In the following we show that ideals which are componentwise of Veronese type have linear quotients.

The following concept is needed for the next results: Let $I \subset J$ be monomial ideals with $G(I) \subset G(J)$. We say that I can be *extended by linear quotients* to J, if the set $G(J) \setminus G(I)$ can be ordered $v_1, \ldots, v_m$ such that $(G(I), v_1, \ldots, v_i) \colon v_{i+1}$ is generated by variables for $i = 1, \ldots, m-1$. In a particular a monomial ideal L has linear quotients, (0) can be extended to L by linear quotients.

It is known ([12, Corollary 2.8]) that an ideal with linear quotients is componentwise linear. In particular, if I has linear quotients and I can be extended to J by linear quotients, then J has linear quotients and hence a linear resolution.

Theorem 3.6. *Let I be an ideal of Veronese type generated in degree d, and J an ideal of Veronese type generated in degree $d+1$ such that $I\mathfrak{m} \subseteq J$. Then $I\mathfrak{m}$ can be extended by linear quotients to J.*

Proof. Let $I = I_{(d;a_1,\ldots,a_n)}$. In the first step of the proof we assume that $J = I_{(d+1;a_1+1,\ldots,a_n+1)}$. Let $u = x_1^{h_1}\cdots x_n^{h_n} \in G(J)$. We define the set

$$S_u = \{i \in [n] \mid h_i = a_i + 1\}$$

and the monomial $\bar{u} = \prod_{i\in S_u} x_i^{h_i}$.

Now we consider the following order for elements of $G(J) \setminus G(I\mathfrak{m})$: we say that $u > v$, if either $|S_u| < |S_v|$, or $|S_u| = |S_v|$ and $\bar{u} >_{\text{lex}} \bar{v}$, or $|S_u| = |S_v|$, $\bar{u} = \bar{v}$ and $u >_{\text{lex}} v$. We also set $u > v$ for all $v \in G(J) \setminus G(I\mathfrak{m})$ and all $u \in G(I\mathfrak{m})$.

We claim that with this order, $I\mathfrak{m}$ can be extended to J by linear quotients. We have to show that for all $u = x_1^{h_1}\cdots x_n^{h_n} \in G(J)$ and all $v = x_1^{t_1}\cdots x_n^{t_n} \in G(J)\setminus G(I\mathfrak{m})$ with $u > v$ there exists $w \in G(J)$ with $w > v$ such that $(w) \colon v = (x_j)$ and x_j divides $u/\gcd(u,v)$. We distinguish several cases.

Case (a): $u \in G(I\mathfrak{m})$ and $v \in G(J) \setminus G(I\mathfrak{m})$. Since $u \in G(I\mathfrak{m})$, there exists $r \in [n]$ such that $h_j \leq a_j$ for $j \neq r$. On the other hand, since $v \in G(J) \setminus G(I\mathfrak{m})$, there exists $l \in [n]$ such that $t_l = a_l + 1$. If there exists $p \neq r$ such that x_p divides $u/\gcd(u,v)$, then $t_p < h_p \leq a_p$. Let $w = (v/x_l)x_p$; then $(w) \colon v = (x_p)$ and $w \in G(J)$ with $w > v$, because $|S_w| < |S_v|$. Next we consider the case that x_p does not divide $u/\gcd(u,v)$ for all $p \neq r$. Then $(u) \colon v = (x_r^c)$ for some integer c. If the $c = 1$, then there is nothing to prove. Otherwise, $t_r + 1 < h_r \leq a_r + 1$. Let $w = (v/x_l)x_r$; then $(w)\colon v = (x_r)$ and $w \in G(J)$ with $w > v$, because $|S_w| < |S_v|$.

Case (b): $u, v \in G(J) \setminus G(I\mathfrak{m})$ and $|S_u| < |S_v|$. Since $v \in G(J) \setminus G(I\mathfrak{m})$, it follows that there exists $l \in [n]$ such that $t_l = a_l + 1$. If there exists $r \in S_u$ with $t_r < a_r$, we set $w = (v/x_l)x_r$. Then $(w)\colon v = (x_r)$ and $w \in G(J)$ with $w > v$, because $|S_w| < |S_v|$. Next we consider the case that $t_r \geq a_r$ for all $r \in S_u$. Since $\deg(u) = \deg(v)$ and $|S_u| < |S_v|$, it follows that there exists $s \in [n] \setminus S_u$ such that $h_s > t_s$. We set $w = (v/x_l)x_s$. Then again $(w)\colon v = (x_s)$, and $w \in G(J)$ with $w > v$, because $|S_w| < |S_v|$.

Case (c): $u, v \in G(J) \setminus G(I\mathfrak{m})$, $|S_u| = |S_v|$ and $\bar{u} >_{\text{lex}} \bar{v}$. There exist l, r such that $r < l$, $h_r = a_r + 1 > t_r$ and $h_l < t_l = a_l + 1$. Let $w = (v/x_l)x_r$; then $(w)\colon v = (x_r)$ and $w \in G(J)$ with $w > v$. Indeed, if $|S_w| < |S_v|$ then $w > v$, and if $|S_w| = |S_v|$, then $\bar{w} >_{\text{lex}} \bar{v}$ and again $w > v$.

Case (d): $u, v \in G(J) \setminus G(I\mathfrak{m})$, $|S_u| = |S_v|$ and $\bar{u} = \bar{v}$ and $u >_{\text{lex}} v$. There exist l, r such that $r < l$, $t_r < h_r \leq a_r$ and $h_l < t_l \leq a_l$. We set $w = (v/x_l)x_r$. Then $(w)\colon v = (x_r)$ and $w \in G(J)$ with $w > v$, because $|S_w| = |S_v|$, $\bar{w} = \bar{v}$ and $w >_{\text{lex}} v$.

In the next step we consider the general case where $J = I_{(d;b_1,\ldots,b_n)}$ and $I\mathfrak{m} \subseteq J$. By the first step we can extend $I\mathfrak{m}$ to $L = I_{(d+1;a_1+1,\ldots,a_n+1)}$ by linear quotients. Since $I\mathfrak{m} \subseteq J$ it follows that $a_i + 1 \leq b_i$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. Therefore, $L \subseteq J$, and hence it suffices to extend L to J by linear quotients.

Set $c_i = a_i + 1$ for $i = 1, \ldots, n$. It is enough to show that $L = I_{(d+1;c_1,\ldots,c_n)}$ can be extended to $K = I_{(d+1;c_1,\ldots,c_{s-1},c_s+1,c_{s+1},\ldots c_n)}$ for some $s \in [n]$. For monomials $u, v \in G(K)$, we say $u > v$, if $u \in G(L)$ and $v \in G(K) \setminus G(L)$ or $u, v \in G(K) \setminus G(L)$ and $u >_{\text{lex}} v$.

We claim that with this order, L can be extended to K by linear quotients. We have to show that for all $u = x_1^{h_1} \cdots x_n^{h_n} \in G(K)$ and all $v = x_1^{t_1} \cdots x_n^{t_n} \in G(K) \setminus G(L)$ with $u > v$ there exists $w \in G(K)$ with $w > v$ such that $(w)\colon v = (x_j)$ and x_j divides $u/\gcd(u, v)$. We distinguish two cases.

(i) $u \in G(L)$ and $v \in G(K) \setminus G(L)$. Since $v \in G(K) \setminus G(L)$, it follows that $t_s = c_s + 1$, so $t_s > h_s$. On the other hand since $\deg(u) = \deg(v)$, there exists $r \in [n]$ such that $h_r > t_r$. Let $w = (v/x_s)x_r$, then $(w)\colon v = (x_r)$ and $w > v$ because $w \in G(L)$.

(ii) $u, v \in G(K) \setminus G(L)$ and $u >_{\text{lex}} v$. So there exist l, r such that $r < l$, $t_r < h_r$ and $h_l < t_l$. Let $w = (v/x_l)x_r$, then $(w)\colon v = (x_r)$ and $w \in G(K)$ with $w > v$, because $w >_{\text{lex}} v$. □

A monomial ideal I is called *componentwise of Veronese type*, if $I_{\langle j \rangle}$ is of Veronese type for all j.

Corollary 3.7. *Let I be an ideal which is componentwise of Veronese type. Then I has linear quotients.*

Proof. It follows from Theorem 3.6 that $I_{\langle j \rangle}\mathfrak{m}$ can be extended to $I_{\langle j+1 \rangle}$ by linear quotients for all j. Hence by [12, Proposition 2.9] I has linear quotients. □

References

[1] A. Conca, J. Herzog, *Castelnuovo-Mumford regularity of products of ideals*, Collect. Math., **54**(2), (2003), 137-152.

[2] D. Eisenbud, *Commutative Algebra with a View Towards Algebraic Geometry.* GTM **150**. Springer 1995.

[3] C. Francisco and A. Van Tuyl, *Some families of componentwise linear monomial ideals*, Nagoya Math. J., **187**, (2007), 115-156.

[4] V. Gasharov, T. Hibi and I. Peeva, *Resolutions of* $\mathbf{a}$*-stable ideals*, J. Algebra, **254**(2), (2002), 375-394.

[5] J. Herzog, T. Hibi, *Monomial Ideals.* GTM **260**. Springer 2010.

[6] J. Herzog, T. Hibi, *Cohen-Macaulay polymatroidal ideals*, European J. Combin., **27**(4), (2006), 513-517.

[7] J. Herzog, T. Hibi and M. Vladoiu, *Ideals of fiber type and polymatroids*, Osaka J. Math., **42**(4), (2005), 807-829.

[8] J.Herzog, T. Hibi, X. Zheng, *Monomial ideals whose powers have a linear resolution*, Math. Scand., **95**(1), (2004), 23-32.

[9] J. Herzog, A. Rauf and M. Vladoiu, *The stable set of associated prime ideals of a polymatroidal ideal*, J. Alg. Comb., **35**, (2012).

[10] J. Herzog, Y. Takayama, *Resolutions by mapping cones*, Homology Homotopy Appl., **4**(2), (2002), part 2, 277-294.

[11] R. Stanley, *Combinatorics and commutative algebra*, Second edition. Progress in Mathematics. **41**. Birkhäuser Boston, Inc., Boston, MA, 1996.

[12] A. Soleyman Jahan, X. Zheng, *Ideals with linear quotients*, J. Combin. Theory Ser. A, **117**(1), (2010), 104-110.

SOMAYEH BANDARI, DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, AZ-ZAHRA UNIVERSITY, VANAK, POST CODE 19834, TEHRAN, IRAN

E-mail address: `somayeh.bandari@yahoo.com`

JÜRGEN HERZOG, FACHBEREICH MATHEMATIK, UNIVERSITÄT DUISBURG-ESSEN, CAMPUS ESSEN, 45117 ESSEN, GERMANY

E-mail address: `juergen.herzog@uni-essen.de`